

OPINION

Editorial Opinion

Poster policy A Failure

I learned earlier this month that the Office of Student Affairs had decided to implement a poster policy that would put restrictions and limits on club advertising. There seems to be several reasons for this new policy, but the most obvious intention is to reduce the amount of clutter throughout the halls and walls of the Reed Union Building.

I state this as the most obvious intention because over half the rules deal with what is actually placed on the walls. Let's take a look at some of these rules. The first rule clearly states that club posters "must not be in excess of 40 (forty) in number." This regulates the *quantity* of posters. The second rule declares that "Penn State-Behrend organizations must carry the 'approved poster' stamp." This procedure governs the *quality* of what is posted. The third rule in mind imposes a *time limit* on posters: "All posters must be removed within three school days after the event."

What does all this bureaucracy mean? ABSOLUTELY NOTHING. The Reed Building is still the same eyesore it was last year. Posters are once again accumulating on the floor and balls of masking tape continue to cling annoyingly to my feet.

I'm not questioning whether or not the poster policy is a legitimate attempt to berid us of this mess, but is it necessary? I don't think so. It's just not working as was planned. The system we are now using is an entirely disorganized, unprofessional, free-for-all.

So what can be done about this repulsive inconvenience? How about abolishing the use of promotional posters altogether?

A more feasible alternative may be to set up a bulletin board system for the exclusive use of promoting club activities. That sounds like an inexpensive way to get out of this slop.

How's this for an offer? If the Office of Student Affairs agrees to abolish the use of wall posters for the publicizing of campus related activities, I will personally see to it that the Penn State-Behrend Collegian sets up a section in each issue entitled "Club News." What's your opinion? We'd like to know ...

Rod Luery
Collegian Editor

Reader Opinion

Downward Deal at Dobbins

To the person(s) responsible:

I am writing to express my personal, if not the campus' feeling towards Dobbins. First, I would like to comment on the food. For anyone playing a varsity sport, one finds that practice is usually from 4-6 p.m., leaving the participants one-half hour to eat. However, the athletes are met by very little, if any, food, and a half-baked salad bar filled only

with empty crocks. On many occasions this fall alone, after going up at 6 p.m., hoping to eat, they simply reply, "Sorry, no more. We ran out." I'm the one that is sorry. Sorry to be paying \$750 for food that is below average, at best, and even more sorry for paying to look at an empty plate. Can't they think to order more food? Second, I would love to know why they spend such a large

amount of money buying Pudding Pops and Scooter Crunches, when they could be improving on their entrees, which I might add, need a lot of improvement. Finally, just out of curiosity, how do they get away calling lunch's hamburgers, which are far from real beef, hamburgers? And breaded veal at dinner? I thought that was false advertising?

Tim Dean
Third Semester, Engineering

Hello, I Must Be Going

Dear Risa and Rod,

I am writing to resign from my position of distribution manager of the **Behrend Collegian**, effective immediately.

When I accepted the position several weeks ago (that of overseeing the expansion of printed newspapers from 2,000 to 5,000, and distributing them to other area campuses, as well as to key points within the city) I was under the impression that the **Collegian** would no longer be soliciting advertisements from abortion clinics. I was wrong in this assumption.

Last year, I protested the inclusion of these ads, without result, while remaining on the staff as a reporter. This year, as distribution manager, I would be forced to promote the **Collegian**, and to allocate copies to various areas. If, in one of these areas, someone

utilized the advertisements in question, I would be unable to justify my actions or maintain an honest relationship with my values.

I still believe that abortion is the taking of innocent life, a life unable to defend itself; that it is a moral outrage. And I am still offended that in a pluralistic society those who hold this view - that of the sanctity of human life - are belittled, and are shunted off as being religious zealots, incapable or undeserving of intellectual scrutiny; that somehow, these people are attempting to impose their personal ethics upon a helpless society.

This is exemplified in the growing number of persons who hold to the pro-choice syndrome of "I'm personally opposed, but I wouldn't want to force my beliefs

upon others. After all, you can't legislate morality." Examination of this mentality horrifies me. One must have a reason for being 'personally opposed,' usually a belief that a fetus is indeed human, so to refuse to attempt to protect this life, by rationalizing behind individual freedom quotients, seems quite barbaric. It seems to me that if someone believes an action is wrong, such as murder, the someone should fight to stop that wrong. Not to do so is an incredible inconsistency, and an unconscionable act.

For me to stay on the staff of the **Collegian** would also demonstrate incredible inconsistency, and an unconscionable act.

Proudly Regretful,
Michael Kitchen
Seventh Semester,
General Arts and Sciences

Commentary

Smoking: Beneath the Levels of Contempt

by Michael Wimms
Collegian Staff Writer

Smoking on campus appears to be a growing fad these days. Whether it be in the dorms, the halls, outside or in Dobbins, it seems to be increasing in its presence.

For the most part, I believe that smoking is the most disgusting, horrid, putrid, filthy, and intolerable of any habit I can think of. It seems that smokers have but one motivator on their minds, self-gratification. They have little regard, if any, for those of us who are human beings and were born and bred to breathe in oxygen. I guess they believe that we non-smokers do not enjoy breathing anything but vile smoke. I for one can't understand this logic.

Food for thought: Have you

ever been to Dobbins when they finally served something good for once? You're enjoying your meal and suddenly out of an oxygen filled room comes this ominous white cloud of nicotine, seeking to invade your lungs. You begin to cough and wheeze and your stomach begins to turn up and down. What started out to be a good meal ends in a nightmare.

I realize that my case in point is a bit melodramatic, but it is true to life. It seems that non-smokers have no respect whatsoever. I know that some are thinking about those non-smoking seating sections. These sections are really a big joke because the cigarette smoke hasn't been told that it is not allowed there, so, it just comes uninvited.

Smokers don't seem to understand that they are not the only

people in this world. Let's say the tables are turned, and smokers are given a bit of their own medicine. Let's also say there's this guy who likes to burn his trash six times a day. The smoke from this trash goes into the house of every smoker on the block: Now, do the smokers have a right to complain? Do they have any idea how they make non-smokers feel? I very much doubt it.

The bottom line is who is right. The majority? Who are the majority? It's really up to those of you who are reading this. Will we non-smokers continue to let ourselves be subjected to second-hand smoke, or will we take a stand and fight this menace? To breathe fresh air should not be taken for granted, as many asthma sufferers will tell you.